

ship building in the country, as well as rendering free from duty all materials imported to be used in the construction of the ships. These generous concessions are certain to create an impetus in ship building circles so that beginning next winter ship building will become again an active industry in the colony, and will result in the recreation of a local shipping fleet of such magnitude and importance as in by-gone days.

Our Part in the War.

In the war the colony is playing its part manfully and well. Its sons to the number of five thousand or thereabouts have responded to the call of duty. More than three thousand of this number have donned the khaki, while the remainder are enrolled amongst the boys in blue. Five thousand men from Newfoundland, which has a population of 250,000, may not seem a great showing, but it is to be remembered that unlike the other Dominions practically every man of these is native born, so that if the colony's contribution be judged from this point of view the aspect of affairs changes and it is at once seen that in proportion to population Newfoundland's contribution is not surpassed by any of the other colonies. St. John's (the capital), with a population of twenty-five thousand, has given two thousand five hundred men.

Confederation with Canada Favorably Viewed.

During the past year a notable change has come over the people in regard to Confederation with Canada. To anyone mixing among the people and discussing politics this reality is at once apparent. The view of the people, perhaps the war accounts for it, is entirely different from what it was at any time previous to the war. The fishermen discuss the pros and cons of union with Canada; four years ago such a thing was unthinkable, without a row.

The marked antipathy to Union with Canada commenced in 1869 when the question was made a political issue. The people of the country divided over the question of the desirability of Confederation into two of the most hostile and bitterest political camps in the history of responsible government in the country. The Anti-Confederates argued that the terms offered by Canada were not liberal, and this added to a campaign appealing to the inherited prejudice of "padding our own canoe," as well as the wilful misrepresentation of the case to the fishermen combined to ignominiously defeat the measure. Since then Confederation has been innately distasteful to the majority of the people, so that the present change of feeling is in the nature of a complete revolution of ideas.

Newfoundland is very anxious to share in the prosperity that will almost certainly be enjoyed by Canada after the war. Nearly everybody is convinced that the reality of Confederation with Canada can at most only be postponed, and that it is but a question of years when unity of government will prevail in the two sister colonies. Newfoundland has great resources. Of herself she has not the money to develop them. Nearly all the people engaged in lumbering and mining, therefore, are most enthusiastically Confederate.

The strategic position of Newfoundland in the North Atlantic, and its incalculable value to Canada, standing as it does at the mouth of the St. Lawrence, through which is sent annually millions of bushels of wheat, the entire Canadian harvest, to Europe, makes it now more likely than ever that Canada would be willing to offer most generous terms to this colony for union.

Newfoundland has always been strongly Imperialistic. Previous to the war there was a common feeling that in Canada there was a silent throbbing for annexation with United States, and the wall of demarcation between ambitions of the two peoples was becoming thinner and thinner. But the war has either confounded or dissipated this idea entirely, and underneath the different shades of political opinions in this colony to-day there is a very real sentiment in favor of Union among all classes, a sentiment that is gathering force every day and becoming more and more representative of the entire wishes of the people. As yet the people of Canada do not or cannot realize that such a great change in so short a time has been consummated; nevertheless what I am saying is true. For instance, my grandfather, who was an active figure in the stormy days of '69, was a fierce Anti-Confederate; my father, too, was an Anti-Confederate; I am now a Confederate, and this is merely typical of numerous other cases I know.

I am a Confederate because seeing Canadians and Newfoundlanders dying shoulder together on the battlefields of France, I see no reason why we cannot live as one, and I believe that in the near future the question of union will become a very live issue.

The Paucity of Prizes

The Welfare of the Many; the Average Man, Must be Taken as the Standard

By J. W. MACMILLAN, D.D.

The Ford Motor Company of Canada claims to be paying a minimum wage of \$1,200 a year. Why do not competing companies do the same? Why does not every factory in Canada do the same?

The Ford Motor Company of Canada has no advantage over other manufacturing industries. It is, indeed, protected from the competition of rivals outside of Canada by a customs tariff, but so are other Canadian industries. It may claim that its phenomenal profits, which make it possible to pay such handsome wages, are due to its own thrift, intelligence, enterprise and shrewdness. It might seem that if other manufacturers were as alert, active and sagacious they, too, could pay their employes a minimum wage of \$1,200 a year. And, therefore, these other manufacturers are to blame, are they not, for the lower profits they make and the lower wages they pay? Is it not their own fault that their profit and loss balance is so modest and that their machinists and clerks earn little more than do school-teachers and ministers of the gospel?

Labor is thus provided with a tu quoque argument against capital which is unanswerable. Whenever the average manual laborer complained that he was not making enough to decently support his family, or that he could not find employment in times of financial stress, he has been used to hear this rejoinder: "It is your own fault. Look at X. He used to work at the bench beside you and now he is an employer and capitalist and rich man. You had the same chance he had and did not take it. He rose out of poverty and drudgery by his own efforts. Why did you not do the same? You have to thank your own laziness and stupidity for your present plight."

So we can imagine the average laborer who works for the average boss saying to that boss, as he strives with all his powers to pay the prevailing wages and keep his shop running, "What is the matter with you? Look at Ford's! Look at the way their business grows! Look at the profits they make! Look at the wages they pay! You had just as good a chance as they had. The reason you have not done so well is that you are no good. Why don't you wake up? See how you have entangled me and yourself together in the sorry and dreary fate caused by your incompetence."

Each Contest Provides One Winner.

Of course, such an argument is all wrong, whether applied to laborers or their employers. The fallacy lies in the assumption, ludicrous on its face, that in a contest all can win. If one prize is offered to a dozen contestants only one of them can possibly win it. To say to one of the defeated, "Why did you not win it, too? is childish, from the standpoint of the interests of the group. He might, indeed, have won it, in which case the present winner would have lost it, and the situation, save for the interchange of these two persons, been precisely the same.

The market for motors in Canada will not allow every motor manufacturer to develop the output and realize the profits of the Ford Motor Company. It is conceivable that some other motor company might have beaten the Ford Company at its own game. In that case the new company would have simply changed places with the Ford Company. Or, again, it is conceivable that two or more companies should have divided between them the paramount success of the Ford Company. In that case the situation would have been qualified, but not radically changed. But it is conceivable that all these companies should have achieved such success.

The market for foremen, junior partners and additional manufacturers is a very limited one. In any shop the most capable workman is likely to be advanced. It is quite possible that some other workman might have out-pointed him for the coveted promotion. But you cannot have a shop composed altogether of foremen. The promotion of one man does not alter the social situation presented by the shop as a whole.

Let us suppose a fire in a crowded theatre. The cry of "Fire! Fire!" is raised. Smoke belches from beneath the stage. In a moment there is a panic. Everybody presses pell-mell for the exits. The orderly audience is transformed into a shrieking, sobbing, fighting mob. Seats are broken. Women are trampled under foot. The aisles are jammed by throngs whose fury to escape wedges them hopelessly together. Those at the doors tear frantically at one another so that scarcely one can get clear

way. In that audience there is a heavy-weight pugilist. Calmly, steadily, remorselessly he cleaves his way to the door, bursts through the struggling mass and passes into the open air. Having made his escape he turns to the frenzied victims, towards whom the flames are now roaring, and shouts, "Why didn't you do as I did? You all had as good a chance as I had. Why didn't you fight your way out like me? It is your own fault that you are being burned alive."

The Average Man.

What we are concerned with as students and citizens is not the industrial destiny of a few persons, but of all. A system which makes pre-eminence of ability the only path to reward is neither democratic nor just. The work of the world is done and will be done by the average man, and he should not be sacrificed.

There is a "speeding up" process carried on in sweat shops. It consists in making the most skilful and rapid worker the standard both of output and of pay. Those who cannot keep up are penalized. So the mass of the workers are both over-driven and under-paid. The alleged justification of "speeding up" is the same cruel fallacy which underlies the doctrine we are considering. It denies the truth that nature makes men unequal in capacity and substitutes the lie that the less able are shirkers.

But this doctrine of "Why didn't you do as he did?" presents a further injustice. It implies that there are enough prizes for all the contestants. In the sweat-shop it is conceivable, though practically impossible, that all should earn the highest pay. For the reward is pay, not a prize. But in the wider realm of competition for superior positions and paramount commercial success such a result is inconceivable. For we are now dealing with prizes, not pay. The prizes, in the nature of the case, are few. The great majority, both of employers and employes, must receive only a moderate recompense for their toil.

The welfare of the many must be studied as a problem in itself. The solution does not lie in the escape and triumph of the few.

A PATRIOTIC DUTY.

We are now approaching the close of the second year of the great world struggle into which Canada has entered with the same zeal and loyalty as are shown by all other parts of the British Empire. Our brave fellows are daily returning from the front, worn out, wounded and scarred, many of them disabled for life, but with the deep satisfaction that they have done their duty for King and Country. Others again have paid the supreme price and have laid down their lives, leaving behind them helpless widows and children. In either case this cruel war is causing intense suffering as the reward of noble sacrifice. How best we can show our appreciation of the bravery and unselfishness of those who are returning from the front has already become one of the serious problems of the war.

The Federal Pension Fund provides pensions as far as possible for these disabled heroes and their families, but a sthe number of returned soldiers increase the fund will be quite inadequate to supply actual needs, much less comforts, to those who have given up everything to fight for us. A great deal more than a pension must be given to our men. The feeling of charity in the ordinary sense of the world must not be allowed to warp the spirit of our giving in this matter. We must make up our minds in some way to supplement largely the Government pensions, and if we were to give until we reached the verge of poverty, we should still be deeply in debt to these men and their dependents. A letter recently to the press from Mr. Angus Sinclair draws special attention to the immediate need for help for our wounded soldiers.

In England a movement has been set on foot by the Prince of Wales as Chairman of what is known as the Central Statutory Committee, which is working under the War Pensions Act, to provide adequately for wounded soldiers, and which combines the efforts of the State, of local authorities and of voluntary associations. In Canada steps are being taken to profit by the good example thus set to us in the old land, and, just as we have been ready to follow the Mother Country into the lines of battle, so should we hasten to emulate her in our efforts to give every possible comfort to our wounded and disabled soldiers.